

MINUTES ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL

Greenville, NC
October 14, 2004

The Greenville City Council met in a regular meeting on the above date at 7:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, third floor of the Municipal Building, with Mayor Robert D. Parrott presiding. The meeting was called to order, followed by the invocation by Council Member Chip Little and the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The following were present.

Mayor Robert D. Parrott
Mayor Pro-Tem Ric Miller
Council Member Mildred A. Council
Council Member Ray Craft
Council Member Pat Dunn
Council Member Rose H. Glover
Council Member Chip Little
Marvin W. Davis, City Manager
Wanda T. Elks, City Clerk
David A. Holec, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Little to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Environmental Advisory Commission

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to appoint Edward Caldwell to fill the slot of "an at-large member from the Greenville community" for an unexpired term expiring April 2006 replacing Ann Tiernan, who relocated. Motion carried unanimously.

Human Relations Council

Motion was made by Council Member Dunn and seconded by Council Member Craft to appoint James Cox for a first three-year term expiring September 2007 replacing Artemis Kares, who is ineligible for reappointment. Motion carried unanimously.

Planning and Zoning Commission

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to continue the appointments to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Motion carried unanimously.

Police Community Relations Committee

The appointments to the Police Community Relations Committee were announced as follows:

- Continuance of Mayor Parrott's appointment to replace Teresa Salle who is ineligible for reappointment.
- Mae Stancill was reappointed by Council Member Dunn to a second two-year term to expire October 2006.
- Regina Wallace was reappointed by Council Member Glover to a first two-year term to expire October 2006.
- Continuance of Mayor Pro-Tem Miller's appointment to replace Louis Warren, who is ineligible for reappointment.

Sheppard Memorial Library

Motion was made by Council Member Council and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to appoint Brian Cooper for a first three-year term expiring October 2007 replacing JoAnne Lewis, who is ineligible for reappointment, and to continue the replacement of Tony Parker, who is ineligible for reappointment. Motion carried unanimously.

Task Force on Preservation of Neighborhoods and Housing

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to appoint Brenda Ernst to replace Mary Clair Biles, who resigned. Motion carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE REZONING HYMAN J. BRODY C/O BRODYCO AND BIRDNECK POINT, LLC PROPERTY LOCATED ALONG SOUTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF EAST TENTH STREET (NC HIGHWAY 33) AND WEST OF OXFORD ROAD, FROM RA20 TO R6A AND A PORTION TO INCLUDE A CONSERVATION AREA OVERLAY – ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 4 and October 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Hyman J. Brody c/o Brodyco and Birdneck Point, LLC to rezone 56.0667 acres located along the southern right-of-way of East Tenth Street (NC Highway 33) and 600± feet west of Oxford Road, from RA20 to R6A and a portion to include a conservation area overlay. The Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend denial of the request, at its August 17, 2004 meeting. At the October 11, 2004 City Council Meeting, the City Council voted on an amended request by the petitioner to expand the conservation area. This is the rezoning request that the City Council has voted to hold the public hearing on.

Mr. Harry Hamilton, City Planner, delineated the property on a map and stated that this is a request to rezone property from RA20 to R6A and CA. Tract 1 is the larger tract, which contains 56 acres that are proposed for R6A. Tract 2 is adjacent to Eastwood and Brook Valley, which is just a little under 13 acres and is part of the 56-acre tract but it is requested as a conservation area overlay. The R6A district that is proposed would allow single-family duplex and multi-family by right. It would also allow student dormitories with a special use permit. The maximum number of dwellings per acre would be nine, which is about half of what is allowed in R6, which

was the previous request that was denied the first of this year. Another highlight of R6A is unlike other zones that allow multi-family, any multi-bedroom apartments, townhouses, or condominiums within R6A have to have at least 1,000 square feet of heated floor space. Other districts that allow multi-family could have substantially less than that. The Building Code would allow even less than 50% of that. A 1,000 square foot dwelling size would be more in line with ownership type units, condominiums, townhouses, etc. Rental apartments containing 1,000 square foot units are also allowed by right. R6S and R9S would have only single-family and that is at the lower end of the medium range between five and seven units per acre. Conservation overlay is requested for the lower portion of the tract. Land within that conservation overlay qualifies for density and density transfer outside of this area to the parent tract. Density from this area cannot be transferred to some other remote receiving area. It would have to be transferred to property that is within the bounds of the parent tract. No construction is allowed in that area except for public streets, parks, drainage improvements and storm retention ponds. Some open space uses are allowed but it must otherwise remain as open space.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the property is located south of Highway 33. Eastgate Subdivision is to the west, where there is commercial development and high density residential development. The area off the road is zoned OR. There are apartments and duplexes in the area closer to the road where there is a mini storage and Bojangles. Those types of uses are zoned Heavy Commercial. To the east there is Meeting House Branch and the Brook Valley Subdivision to the south as well as to the west. Pirates Cove is to the north and this area is currently zoned R6A. Between Pirates Cove and Court House Subdivision, which is a single-family district, is the proposed site of the City fire station. The total acreage is 56 acres in the combined site. Staff believes that the developable acreage here is somewhere between 35 and 40 and those are areas outside of future right-of-ways, floodways, and stream buffers that impact the site.

Mr. Hamilton stated that under the current zoning, RA20, or some other type of single-family district that would be allowed within the medium-density category, 170 single-family clustered homes similar to Brookridge or Yorkshire off of York Road are anticipated. Under the proposed zoning, it is anticipated that there will be between 320 and 360 standard multi-family units, condos, townhouses or apartments. Land Use Intensity (LUI) includes student dormitories such as Pirates Cove, which would require special use permit approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission. That would be done by or under a separate public hearing conducted by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The current zoning or other single-family zone of 170 clustered units would generate about 1,600 trips per day. The proposed zoning where there would be 300 or more multi-family units could generate as much as 2,800 trips per day. Council is looking at an additional 1,200 trips. Staff anticipates build-out on a site like this within two to five years. Highway 33 is a "gateway corridor" into the City and a five-lane major thoroughfare with sidewalks on both sides. The design is 33,500 average daily trips, which is at a standard level of service. The current adjusted traffic estimate along Highway 33 between Oxford Road and Sterling University is 18,000 trips per day, which is a 2002 count that has been adjusted for growth. Counts are higher at the Greenville Boulevard intersection. The State counts are around 24,000 trips per day, which is expected because of two major thoroughfares. Tenth Street and Greenville Boulevard intersect in the middle of a community-focus area, which is a service retail destination for people. The majority of new trips into or from this site would be to the west toward Greenville and would be somewhere between 75% and 80%. That would be the primary destination for people who live in that area. Unfortunately, all access to the site will be via

Highway 33. There are no opportunities for interconnectivity with any of the surrounding properties, so all traffic will have to access Highway 33. Commuter congestion is a problem at peak periods, especially in the morning. Left turn movements from the site are going to be problematic for any type of development on this project, single-family or multi-family. Persons leaving this site are going to have to drive across two lanes of eastbound traffic, across a center turning lane and then merge into traffic, especially when it is backed up. There are several new commercial projects at the intersection of Greenville Boulevard and Tenth Street, and required road improvements are being made. There are right turn lanes being extended in front of the Rivergate Shopping Center and two dual left hand turn lanes for traffic heading south on Greenville Boulevard. Those improvements will help in the immediate intersection.

Mr. Hamilton stated that if the site is rezoned, it could be developed for student housing, which is a likely scenario considering the other student housing projects. Sterling University and Pirates Cove are in the immediate area. That is under either standard multi-family such as Cape Pointe, which is a development directly behind the Rivergate Shopping Center, or it could be a LUI type dormitory such as River Pointe Village, which is directly behind Hastings Ford. Students as a group typically generate less early morning traffic than the general population. They also have greater transit ridership, especially when they are going to a specific destination. The ECU bus service is in this area and it provides services for Sterling University. A traffic impact report and a drainage study will be required at the time of plan submission, whether it is for single-family or multi-family. Traffic litigation measures will be required including turn lanes into the site for either type of development. The City's storm drain regulations and the new stormwater rules will apply to any development. Access into the site will have to be aligned with the developments north of Highway 33 into either the drives or the streets into those developments.

Mr. Hamilton delineated on the map the environmentally sensitive areas that are associated with Meeting House Branch. The flood hazard area of Meeting House Branch serves as a natural buffer. It is a vegetated area, which cannot be built in. It separates this area from Brook Valley Subdivision and the width is anywhere between 150 to several hundred feet. It is a substantial natural separation to the development to the east. Construction is prohibited within those environmentally sensitive areas, the floodway, wetlands, water quality stream buffers, and future greenways and the conservation overlay. Those areas do qualify for density transfer, but no construction of any kind is allowed there. There are floodplains on the property and development is allowed in that floodplain area. Any development would be prohibited in the floodway. Adjacent to that, the first floor elevation would have to be raised a foot above the base flood level or to the five hundred year flood level accordance with the rules adopted last spring, whichever is higher. These floodplain areas follow narrow canals. This is not a broad floodplain like north of the river and it's not that likely that there will be a need to build units encroaching into that floodplain area.

Mr. Hamilton delineated the surrounding zoning on the map and stated that there are a variety of patterns and more intensive development to the west. On the rezoning map, there is a small area of land adjacent to the Brook Valley Subdivision, which is about 100 feet deep and 600 feet long, comprising about 1.5 acre, which has been excluded from this request. That area is wetlands and could not be developed with or without being including in an overlay or in the R6A area and is also part of the parent tract. That area is to remain RA20.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the Land Use Plan map recommends medium-density for the entire tract with the exception of the areas indicated as floodplains areas, which would be expected to be reserved under other existing standards. The western boundary of this property is very clear and forms the transition between the higher intensity usage to the west and lower intensity usage on the interior. Heavy Commercial and Office zoning areas are currently built and they have a significant impact on the western portion of this property. Staff expects that the western area of this property would be developed for multi-family under the R6A standards. Staff does not believe that it would be reasonable to expect anyone to build single-family on this entire site. Single-family housing would not be anticipated, especially in the area directly adjacent to the commercial. Staff believes that the eastern and southern area of the tract should be developed in a compatible manner with the surrounding single-family neighborhoods. The medium-density recommendations accommodate the entire range from attached dwellings to single-family. In January 2004, the Council denied a request to rezone the property, which was a 45-acre tract at that time to R6, high density residential. This new request represents a different classification all together. It is about half the density as previously would have been allowed under the previous R6 request.

Mr. Hamilton further explained that this request, unlike the original request, does include a conservation overlay. He stated that these are two positive changes in consideration of the request that was originally considered by Council in January 2004. In light of those changes, Council must decide if the anticipated proposed land use, which is multi-family across the entire site, and the relative scale of development looking around 300 units on this property will have a similar impact on the character in the area and transportation system. A Sterling University or Pirates Cove type of development could still be built on this property. Medium-density multi-family is expected in the area directly south of Pirates Cove adjacent to the commercial area. In staff's opinion, a compatible pattern of development would result in the R6A multi-family being located on the western part of the tract and lower density on the eastern part, yielding around 160 multi-family units to the west and around 85 single-family clustered homes to the east. There is a 4.5-acre tract in the middle. Whatever this property is zoned; this tract as well would likely be zoned and would potentially yield an additional 40 units. The combined sites, even under the preferred scenario, would result into 285 units. If all the property is zoned R6A, including the 4.5-acre tract in the middle in the future, there would be 360 units on this site and an additional 40 units with a total of 400 units potentially. There is fairly a significant difference in the two scenarios. If all the property is zoned R6A, there would be approximately 90 to 110 additional dwellings for the combined sites. Any development on this property would have an impact on traffic, which is one of the primary concerns.

Mr. Hamilton concluded by stating that the proposed R6A zoning is within the recommended medium-density range. Council should consider whether multi-family across the entire site is in keeping with the intent of the plan and whether the community character and traffic concerns would warrant denial of this request. This property is referred to as an infield site and will be developed. The issues are what is the appropriate intensity, how many dwellings should be allowed on this property, and what is the desired character and what type and where. Another factor is whether the choice that the Council makes as far as the scale type and location impact the public facilities such as streets to a disproportionate degree in comparison to development that would be allowed under the existing zoning or some other scenario. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended denial of the request.

Upon being asked if the conservation overlay would reduce the number of units that transfers to the other piece of property, Mr. Hamilton responded that the area within the conservation overlay would qualify for density calculation and that density can theoretically be transferred. This is a high ground piece of property on the interior and could be developed. Two things are being done. It is not just taking wetlands or swapping land and using that for density transfer. They are taking away the ability to potentially develop a high ground area that they get qualifications for; but they are losing good buildable area. They can transfer those units if they can get them on the site. The northernmost part of the area could have been included in the conservation area. The area in the wetland area couldn't be developed. Therefore, it wouldn't matter whether or not it was being included in the R6A portion or left out.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience.

Mr. Jerry Eatman, an attorney with Lynch and Eatman, 5400 Glenwood Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina, stated their firm is here tonight representing the applicant. Mr. Eatman thanked the Council for the continuance of this request from last month to give them an opportunity to take more time to meet with adjoining landowners in this case. Fortunately, the staff's report was comprehensive, but there are four factors that the applicant has to address in this case. First is conformity with the Comprehensive Plan. R6A is a medium-density classification. The Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan called for medium-density in this location. In terms of that requirement, this request meets the Comprehensive Plan. Secondly, R6A is compatible with the surrounding zoning pattern. Immediately adjacent to the property there is intensive commercial development and high density residential. Up and down East Tenth Street this is the zoning pattern that has been going on in this corridor. There is no access to this property from the single-family residential around the sides. The corridor, the zoning pattern, that this property is a part of is medium to high density residential and commercial development. The pattern is not more low-density single-family residential development. It is compatible with the zoning pattern. As far as the adjacent land uses, there is a significant amount of single-family residential. This request is compatible with the existing and future adjacent land uses because R6A is a medium-density classification. In the Horizons Plan, R6A is considered a good transition zone between high-density residential and commercial development and low density single-family residential. More importantly, this request is compatible with those adjacent land uses because of the enormous conservation overlay component to this request. In terms of design, the overlay minimizes the impact of this medium-density residential on the surrounding properties. There are thirteen acres, nine of which are developable good property, which has been put into a conservation overlay to provide the kind of buffers necessary to make this compatible with the adjacent residential uses. The other factor is the impact on the traffic. The existing counts are 18,000. The difference between what kind of traffic would be generated by what it is zoned now and fully developed and what could be there under this request is 1,200 trips per day. This is clearly within the capacity of this particular roadway. That is not to say that traffic doesn't occasionally backup on that road. This property is prime for development. The conservation overlay is being added in as part of the medium-density request. This proposal is a good compromise in terms of that impact on the traffic. For all of those residential property owners on the backside of this property, this property has been undeveloped for many years and it has been a very nice natural area. A lot of people hate to see it get changed. The key for them is to make sure that it is changed in a manner that is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and meets the requirements of the City's Code and that it is done so in a responsible way.

Mr. Jon Day stated that over the last thirty days he and Mr. Brody have taken the time to meet several of the residents in the Eastwood and Brook Valley Subdivisions. They presented them the amended request, which included the additional conservation overlay district. Their proposal for the property was discussed in detail and they had a good opportunity to receive input. As a result of these meetings, several of the residents withdrew their names from the protest petition. In addition, they met with the Brook Valley Homeowners Association. Mr. Day further stated the request is one that sets aside a significant area for the conservation overlay, which will have a positive effect on the neighbors who live in that area. There about 13 acres, but only 9 acres are high usable land area. Some of the residents of Eastwood have narrow backyards, and this will be an extension of their backyards. In his opinion, their property values will increase. The proposal has also been discussed in detail with several of the residents of Tenth Street and input received. After considering all of the factors, this request will have a positive impact on the residents. The residents in Eastwood and Brook Valley will be buffered by the conservation overlay. There is a large tract of wetland area that provides a good natural buffer between any residential development in Brook Valley. In conclusion, this request is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and they are requesting the Council's approval.

Mr. Donnie Brewer, President of Rivers and Associates, stated that a drainage study would be required for this piece of land. At last month's meeting, the City Council passed the most comprehensive stormwater plan that the City has had before, and this tract will fall under those regulations. Those regulations will not only address the water quantity for this project but also water quality. The project will actually capture and treat runoff from the first one-inch of rainfall. It will provide nutrient reduction for nitrogen and phosphorous. There are riparian buffers provided on the streams although on this tract there are a lot of buffers and the overlay district is going to provide some more buffers. In addition, the erosion and sedimentation control would have to be developed, a study made and that will also be submitted to the City Engineering Department for their review and approval. For this particular tract the study should be and will be under the new rules and regulations, which are quite comprehensive and detailed and should provide adequate protection for the adjoining property owners. Mr. Brody is well aware of the requirements and wants to provide a good drainage plan for this development.

Mrs. Marjorie Rhodes Harris of 105 Barnes Street and property owner of 3430 and 3440 East Tenth Street stated that she and her parents have owned these properties for approximately 65 years. Part of her property is adjacent to Mr. Brody's property. She understands the future development plans as explained to her by Mr. Brody and Mr. Day. She is satisfied with their explanation and has no objection to the Brody property being rezoned as requested.

Mr. Hyman Brody stated that part of the reason that he purchased this land was to make certain that it was developed in a manner that was compatible with the surrounding residential uses, including his parents' house. He has listened to what the neighbors and City Council had to say when he first requested the rezoning of the property to R6. He came back with a much better request with the rezoning of R6A with this substantial conservation overlay. He needs to be able to develop this property, and this request will allow him to do so with the conservation overlay. He has tried to be responsive to the concerns of the neighbors and others and thinks that the number of people who have elected to support their request once they learned the true facts and full story illustrates their commitment to making a responsible proposal. With a parcel of property this large in an urban area, it is going to be hard to make everyone happy with any

rezoning request. A reduction from R6 to R6A is about 43% of the land that they can develop. Also, the conservation area that they have enclosed has nine acres of upland that they could develop and bring behind the people of Eastwood and Brook Valley Subdivisions. By putting this conservation overlay on the property, he doesn't want it in any way to be discounted because it was a major concession to provide the people with a big buffer and protection that they know there will never be anything else there or beyond their property. It adequately covers the transportation need as well. There have been some comments from different neighbors that they need to be concerned about traffic running through Brook Valley. Whether this land is zoned R6A or whether it is developed at RA20, there will be continuous usage down Highway 33. People will be coming to the Council for other developments and those developments will create traffic. If the members of Brook Valley are worried about traffic, he suggests that perhaps they need to make it a gated community. It is not only going to be this parcel that is going to create traffic. There will be other parcels that will come in at a later date. That is a reasonable alternative for the homeowners association and those neighbors there to consider. The petitioners have gone from door to door and talked to a lot of the people. Mr. Brody stated that their request more than meets the later and the spirits of the City's requirements.

Mrs. Elaine Brestal of 106 Christenbury Drive stated that once the property owner gets the R6A zoning, he can build what he wants. He can sell it to a less sensitive person than Mr. Brody, who can develop it. Mrs. Brestal gave a history of what has happened. The residents came before the Council in January 2004 and at that time they opposed the high density issues. Then Mr. Brody moved the property line back so that they could not get a valid petition. Last month, a valid protest petition was submitted. Mr. Brody talked to the people who signed the protest petition about houses on stilts in this conversation overlay and got them to opt out of the valid petition. These people do not want 24 students per acre on their property. Mr. Brody has shown a plan of the area where he could divide into lots and sell them to various builders estimated that the price would be \$95,000. A list of the students that will be coming from the University shows that in the next eight years, there will be 3,400 needing housing students and many will be graduate students. They will not be living in the mega complexes that are being built. The University is against these large complexes because they invite "beer city" with parties, liquor and drugs. This has been a problem in other cities such as Raleigh. She has given the Council a picture of the traffic that was taken this morning of where the new fire station is going and it is a solid wall of traffic that people are going to have to turn into. The City has a large tract of land that was purchased for a cemetery that will be developed. There is a large tract of land behind Cliff's Seafood. Simpson has been growing by leaps and bounds. There is Tenth Street coming from the east and then they have to swing all the way over to Charles Boulevard to have another entry from the east and the south east to come into Greenville. There is already a problem and it will not go away and will only get worse and more congested. She talked to Steve Hamilton at NCDOT who informed her that Tenth Street is a mobility street and its purpose is to quickly move people in and out of the city. It should have a minimum of driveways. In the 7/10 of a mile from Greenville Boulevard to Oxford Road, there are 30 driveways. This is against the City's purpose of moving people quickly and is creating a bottleneck. In the morning there is not a lot of stopping at the drugstores, etc. There is a steady line at Bojangles. Also, this morning there was a steady line of cars coming out of Pirates Cove and students were riding the bus. They do drive their cars into town. The estimate of traffic that the Council received was east of Oxford Road. These people are not going east; they are going west into this already congested area. There is a Food Lion, gas station, two drugstores, an ABC store, and a popular gas station

where there is a lot of activity in the morning. There is not a lot of activity at the food store, but Bojangles is very active in the morning. In the afternoon, people make all of the stops. There are people on the north and south sides both making a lot of left and right turns and people going east and west as fast as they can. It is like a giant pinball machine being played with automobiles. This community is saturated with apartment complexes. There are multiple vacancies for apartments everywhere in town. Mrs. Brestal questioned what the City is going to do when the apartment owners are in financial difficulty and these apartments are vacant. After 2010, the census indicates that this age group is actually going to decrease. The population that will go up is the elderly. Starting in 2010 to 2025, North Carolina will become the 10th state in the country in the number of elderly. There will be an estimated 2.2 million elderly persons, a lot of those in the coastal region and mountains. She thinks that they do not deserve to have this traffic. More student housing is not needed.

Council Member Craft questioned whether it is the role of government to control the real estate market as far as student housing or apartments or should that be the private sector, to which Mrs. Brestal responded that she has seen a market survey that says it's saturated. She thinks that it is the role of the government to provide safely for its citizens. If this complex creates danger for students and citizens, it is the role of the government. The government controls the real estate market already. The City already controls zoning. She could present the Council with many studies showing that the apartments are not needed.

Council Member Little stated that a statement was made that the elderly population is the one that is increasing instead of the younger population and the question was where are the elderly going to live. From his prospective, the Council is dealing with a zoning issue. Mr. Brody may build a multi-family complex for the elderly. He thinks that the role of the City Council is to determine whether the zoning meets the criteria and whether it is in keeping with the land use plan. It is not the Council's job to tell Mr. Brody that this is a spot for student housing. The marketplace will set that. If there is a buyer or sale or consumer that wants to be there, that's what will control that. He cannot make the assumption that it is going to be student housing. As a Council Member, he has to look at it in a broad sense so that he can be consistent.

Mrs. Brestal referred to Item E - Other factors which advance public health, safety and welfare and stated that the road is not going and that many people are not going to meet Item E. Mr. Brody does not have to put single-family housing on Christenbury Drive. Just because the City recommends single-family housing, he or whoever buys that property can do what they want. She does not have any protection there.

Upon being asked whether there is any advantage of having the additional conservation overlay, Mrs. Brestal responded that she thinks it would be wonderful. She stated that Mr. Brody said that he put a lot of thought into this and this came out last month, when they got a valid protest petition. She knows that the greenways are going to have access through there as well and that is wonderful. She encourages that and wants people riding bicycles and walking. There is really not much public access to the conservation overlay until greenways come through.

Upon being asked if a conservation overlay gets approved could they ever come back and ask that it be converted back to housing, Mr. Hamilton responded that they could always apply.

Mr. Greg Wright of 102 Oxford Road stated that in his opinion, the rezoning request of R6A is inappropriate due to the property not having any connectivity other than Highway 33. The proposed rezoning will allow the development of multi-family housing that will add to current congestion problems not only on Highway 33, but also on Oxford Road and Brook Valley. Mr. Wright stated that he feels that it is inappropriate to build massive multi-family housing adjacent to single-family homes. There needs to be a transition that will protect the property owners. In closing, Mr. Wright stated that he has been a lifelong resident of Greenville. He is very proud of Greenville's growth and it has been fun to watch, but it must be done responsibly. For the most part, they have done that. Continuing to allow zoning that enables students housing complexes on Highway 33 and the intersection of 264, in his opinion, is not responsible and/or is needed. Mr. Wright thanked the Council for their time and consideration of his comments.

Upon being asked whether he would be supportive of the R6A zoning of the lower density development on the Brook Valley side, Mr. Wright responded that he would certainly be open to cluster homes on the Brook Valley side and R6A back on the other side towards the commercial development.

Mr. Paul Nethercutt of 3381 E. Tenth Street questioned why Mr. Brody fixed the overlay on the nine acres. It is so expensive to get to it because he has to build a bridge and go through wetlands to get to it. The people had the petition against it, which kept them from protesting. Mr. Nethercutt commented on the safety features. There is one way to get into the 56 acres, which is off of Tenth Street. He asked if the Council had considered the Fire Department, Rescue Squad, and Police Department having to get in there. Mr. Nethercutt stated that it is the wrong thing to develop and he has over a 30-year investment in his house. Any time that there is a multi-family dwelling request, he is going to still oppose it. Mr. Nethercutt thanked the Council for their time.

Upon being asked if a line is drawn basically half way through the property or so would he be in favor of having the portion that is directly south of his neighborhood being single-family and that the area basically lining up with Pirates Cove west being multi-family, Mr. Nethercutt stated that he would consider that; however, he would like to know more about it before saying yes. He would like to see some plans and to know who is going to put it there.

Ms. Sarah Gallagher of 105 Christenbury Drive read a letter from Jackie Fowler.

“COPY”

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Jackie Fowler and I live off of Portertown Road. I am writing this letter because I cut through Brook Valley every day on my way to work off of Red Banks Road. When I cut through there, I see people on a daily basis speeding and hitting the speed bumps way too fast. They hit them so hard that their cars bounce up and down after going over them. In my opinion, King George Road to York to get to 14th Street is a way that people use to get from one side of town to the other instead of going to Fire Tower or Tenth Street. It has become a busy cut through street. If you have any questions or comments you can reach me.

“COPY”

Ms. Gallagher stated that she walks with her children everyday between 7:30 AM and 8:00 AM through the Brook Valley neighborhood. She is astounded at the amount of cut through traffic there is down Oxford Road. Vehicles go 35 miles an hour, hitting the speed bumps really quickly. For those walking and jogging through the neighborhood it is really disturbing. Her concern with these developments is increasing the traffic on Greenville Boulevard. The easy way out of the development would be to go to the right, cut down Oxford Road to York and then back out to 14th Street, Greenville Boulevard. Oxford/York Road are going to become major highways. There is no solution to that with the only entrance going on to Highway 33 from the new development.

Upon being asked whether she would be supportive of the R6A zoning of the lower density development on the Brook Valley side, Ms. Gallagher responded that it is a great idea but if the Council approves the R6A zoning, the petitioner can build whatever he wants to. With the R6A zoning, there is no guarantee once the zoning is approved.

Mr. Eric Brestal of 106 Christenbury Drive stated that North Carolina General Statute 160 (A) – 383 is designed to outline a comprehensive plan to be used by communities. He read it to the Council.

Mayor Parrott then closed the public hearing.

Council Member Little stated that this request came to Council in January 2004 and he voted in opposition of the R6 zoning. At the time, it showed that there was going to be a potential 565 units. If the tracts were developed under R6, which the Comprehensive Plan generally recommends, it would yield what they are asking tonight, 320 units. The information from staff indicates that the change being proposed is not a significant change from the previously denied request; however, it is a 43 percent decrease, which is significant. He believes that they have met all of the criteria and it meets the Comprehensive Plan. The traffic is going to increase no matter what the Council rezones it. The applicant has increased the buffer requirements, and there is a large buffer between the Brook Valley residents. He does not see any reason not to approve the request.

Council Member Dunn stated that it has to be zoned something. They could take the part of the eastern portion, and not RA20 but a little lower density, and reach some sort of compromise. It would seem to work for all the people in that area.

Council Member Craft stated that traffic increase is less than 10% and it really only affects those west from the stoplight at Oxford Road. Again, the request meets the criteria before the Council.

Mayor Parrott reminded the Council that Mayor Pro-Tem Miller had been excused from voting on this request.

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Council to adopt the ordinance rezoning 56.0667 acres located along the southern right-of-way of East Tenth Street (NC Highway 33) and 600± feet west of Oxford Road, from RA20 to R6A and a portion to include a conservation area overlay. Motion carried with a vote of 4:1. Council Members

Craft, Little, Council and Glover voted in favor of the request. Council Member Dunn voted in opposition. (Ordinance No. 04-117)

ORDINANCE REZONING COVENGTON GROUP, LTD. PROPERTY LOCATED ALONG THE WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF ARLINGTON BOULEVARD AT THE INTERSECTION OF ARLINGTON BOULEVARD AND TURNBURY DRIVE, SOUTH OF BRADFORD DRIVE, NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF ARLINGTON BOULEVARD AND FIRE TOWER ROAD, FROM OR TO CG - ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 4 and October 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Covengton Group, Ltd. to rezone 0.276 acres located along the western right-of-way of Arlington Boulevard at the intersection of Arlington Boulevard and Turnbury Drive, 600± feet south of Bradford Drive, and 950± feet north of the intersection of Arlington Boulevard and Fire Tower Road, from OR to CG. The Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend approval of the request at its September 21, 2004 meeting.

Mr. Hamilton delineated the property on a map and stated that the property was rezoned from RA20 to 0&I in 1989 in conjunction with the zoning plan for Covengton Downes commercial area. A portion of the subject property is currently part of an approved site plan. Once rezoned, the property may be recombined with the adjacent property to the west and south. To the north of the property is Bradford Park, Section 3. To the south, east and west, the property is vacant. The proposed rezoning is in general compliance with the Horizons Plan and Land Use Plan Map. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning area lies within Vision Area "D". A major objective for area "D" states that commercial expansion should be limited to the crossroads of Fire Tower Road and Arlington within retail nodes. The property is part of the regional node proposed for that area. Staff considers this amendment to the original zoning plan as a minor deviation, and the resulting zoning maintains the desired office buffer to the Covengton Downes commercial area established in 1997.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Council to adopt the ordinance rezoning 0.276 acres located along the western right-of-way of Arlington Boulevard at the intersection of Arlington Boulevard and Turnbury Drive, 600± feet south of Bradford Drive, and 950± feet north of the intersection of Arlington Boulevard and Fire Tower Road, from OR to CG. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-118)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING ARBOR HILLS PROPERTY, SECTION 6, LOTS 41, 42, 43, AND 43A LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF PLATEAU DRIVE, EAST OF KNOLL CIRCLE – ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on August 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by the owners of Arbor Hills to annex Lots 41, 42, 43, and 43A involving approximately

2.1054 acres located on the south side of Plateau Drive and about 174 feet east of Knoll Circle. This is a contiguous annexation.

Mr. Merrill Flood, Director of Planning and Community Development, delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 4. The property is currently residential, containing four single-family dwellings, and the proposed use will be the same. The current population is 10, with the anticipated population at full developing being ten. The minority population is 0. The purpose of the annexation is to receive City services.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance annexing Arbor Hills, Lots 41, 42, 43, and 43A involving approximately 2.1054 acres located on the south side of Plateau Drive and about 174 feet east of Knoll Circle. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-119)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING LEON HARDEE AND MAXINE SPEIGHT PROPERTY (WOODRIDGE CORPORATE PARK) LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NCSR 1203 (ALLEN ROAD) AND ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES OF WOODRIDGE PARK ROAD (PRIVATE STREET) – ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Leon Hardee and Maxine Speight to annex Woodridge Corporate Park involving 28.8910 acres located on the west side of NCSR 1203 (Allen Road) and on the north and south sides of Woodridge Park Road (Private Street). This is a noncontiguous annexation.

Mr. Flood delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 1. The property is currently a commercial park and that use will continue. The current and proposed population is 0.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Glover and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to adopt the ordinance annexing Woodridge Corporate Park involving 28.8910 acres located on the west side of NCSR 1203 (Allen Road) and on the north and south sides of Woodridge Park Road (Private Street). Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-120)

ORDINANCE ANNEXING LEROY CHERRY PROPERTY (ALLEN RIDGE, SECTION ONE) LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NCSR 1203 (ALLEN ROAD) AND NORTH OF TEAKWOOD DRIVE - ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by Leroy Cherry to annex Allen Ridge, Section One involving 22.201 acres located on

the west side of NCSR 1203 (Allen Road) and about 252 feet north of Teakwood Drive. This is a noncontiguous annexation.

Mr. Flood delineated the property on a map and stated that the property is located in Voting District 1. The property is currently vacant, and the proposed use is for 21 single-family dwellings, 34 duplexes and an office building. The current population is 0, and the anticipated population at full development is 218, with 26 being minority.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance annexing Allen Ridge, Section One involving 22.201 acres located on the west side of NCSR 1203 (Allen Road) and about 252 feet north of Teakwood Drive. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-121)

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY THE PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (AS INITIATED AND DIRECTED BY CITY COUNCIL) AMENDING ZONING REGULATIONS TO INCLUDE NEW USE ENTITLED "RESTAURANT; REGULATED OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES" WHICH EXEMPTS ACCESSORY RESTAURANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES FROM SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUIREMENT UPON COMPLIANCE WITH SPECIFIC CRITERIA - ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 4 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by the Planning and Community Development Department as initiated and directed by City Council to amend the zoning regulations to include a new use entitled "Restaurant; regulated outdoor activities" which exempts accessory restaurant outdoor activities from the special use permit requirement upon compliance with specific criteria. At its September 21, 2004 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Hamilton stated that this is a request to amend the zoning regulations regarding restaurants with outdoor activities. Restaurants are currently a permitted or special use in all non-residential districts with the exception of the Medical-Institutional and the Office zone. In all other districts restaurants are either permitted by right or require a special use permit. Outdoor activities are regulated with a special use permit for all those restaurants. This ordinance deals with the outdoor activities section only. In 1991, City Council amended the rules to acquire all outdoor activities to obtain a special use permit through the Board of Adjustment. Since that time, 23 permits have been issued, 10 since 2001.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance amending the zoning regulations to include a new use entitled "Restaurant; regulated outdoor activities" which exempts accessory restaurant outdoor activities from the

special use permit requirement upon compliance with specific criteria. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-122)

ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT AMENDING ZONING REGULATIONS TO INCLUDE A PURPOSE STATEMENT FOR R6A-RU DISTRICT UNDER ARTICLE D, PART 2, IN ADDITION TO PURPOSE STATEMENT ADOPTED AND CODIFIED AS SEC. 9-4-200 – ADOPTED

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 4 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a request by the Planning and Community Development Department to amend the zoning regulations to include a purpose statement for the R6A-RU district under Article D, Part 2, in addition to the purpose statement adopted and codified as Sec. 9-4-200. There is no change to the existing purpose and intent, definition and standards of the R6A-RU district as previously adopted. At its September 21, 2004 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Hamilton stated that this is a clean-up ordinance and there are no changes in the regulations.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance amending the zoning regulations to include a purpose statement for the R6A-RU district under Article D, Part 2, in addition to the purpose statement adopted and codified as Sec. 9-4-200. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-123)

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND ORDINANCES RELATING TO STRUCTURES THAT HAVE BEEN BOARDED UP BY ORDER OF THE CITY FOR MORE THAN A 12-MONTH PERIOD - ADOPTED

621 Ford Street

City Manager Davis stated that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 2 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider the ordinance to demolish structures at 621 Ford Street.

Mr. Carl Rees, Neighborhood Services Coordinator, stated that the structure at 621 Ford Street has been in violation of the Minimum Housing Code for a period of more than six years, during which time the property has also been in chronic violation of the City's public nuisance codes. Greenville Utilities last served the structure in February 2001, and taxes on the property are in arrears. The structure has been vacant with no efforts made toward repair for a period of more than one year. The Greenville Fire Department has declared the structure to be a fire hazard, and all required notifications have been made to the property owners as per Title 9 of the Greenville City Code.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance authorizing and directing the Neighborhood Services Coordinator to proceed to either repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 621 Ford Street and owned by Patricia Hill Moore in the event the owner fails to comply with the provisions of Section 1 of this ordinance within ninety (90) days. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-124)

609 Hudson Street

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 2 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider the ordinance to demolish structures at 609 Hudson Street.

Mr. Rees stated that the structure at 609 Hudson Street has been in violation of the Minimum Housing Code for a period of more than six years, during which time the property has also been in chronic violation of the City's public nuisance codes. Greenville Utilities last served the structure in May 2002 and taxes on the property are in arrears. The structure has been vacant with no efforts made toward repair for a period of more than one year. The Greenville Fire Department has declared the structure to be a fire hazard, and all required notifications have been made to the property owners as per Title 9 of the Greenville City Code.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance authorizing and directing the Neighborhood Services Coordinator to proceed to either repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 609 A & B Hudson Street and owned by Arnold and Marlene Gaspersohn in the event the owners fail to comply with the provisions of Section 1 of this ordinance within ninety (90) days. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-125)

421 Nash Street

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 2 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider the ordinance to demolish structures at 421 Nash Street.

Mr. Rees stated that the structure at 421 Nash Street has been in violation of the Minimum Housing Code for a period of more than two years, during which time the property has also been in chronic violation of the City's public nuisance codes. Greenville Utilities last served the structure in May 2002 and taxes on the property are in arrears. The structure has been vacant with no efforts made toward repair for a period of more than one year. The Greenville Fire Department has declared the structure to be a fire hazard and all required notifications have been made to the property owners as per Title 9 of the Greenville City Code.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to adopt the ordinance authorizing and directing the Neighborhood Services Coordinator to proceed to vacate the dwelling of all occupants and to remove or demolish the dwelling located at 421 Nash Street and owned by Christine B. Barnes and Annie Laura Porter. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-126)

1105 West Sixth Street

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 2 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider the ordinance to demolish structures at 1105 West Sixth Street.

Mr. Rees stated that the structure located at 1105 West Sixth Street has been in violation of the Minimum Housing Code for a period of more than six years, during which time the property has also been in chronic violation of the City's public nuisance codes. Greenville Utilities last served the structure in June 1997, and taxes on the property are in arrears. The structure has been vacant with no efforts made toward repair for a period of more than one year. The Greenville Fire Department has declared the structure to be a fire hazard, and all required notifications have been made to the property owners as per Title 9 of the Greenville City Code.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Glover to adopt the ordinance authorizing and directing the Neighborhood Services Coordinator to proceed to either repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 1105 West Sixth Street and owned by The Willis Hemby Heirs in the event the owners fail to comply with the provisions of Section 1 of this ordinance within ninety (90) days. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-127)

100 Tyson Street

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 2 and 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider the ordinance to demolish structures at 100 Tyson Street.

Mr. Rees stated that the structure at 100 Tyson Street has been in violation of the Minimum Housing Code for a period of more than six years, during which time the property has also been in chronic violation of the City's public nuisance codes. Greenville Utilities last served the structure in April 2002, and taxes on the property are in arrears. The structure has been vacant with no efforts made toward repair for a period of more than one year. The Greenville Fire Department has declared the structure to be a fire hazard, and all required notifications have been made to the property owners as per Title 9 of the Greenville City Code.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to adopt the ordinance authorizing and directing the Neighborhood Services Coordinator to proceed to either repair or demolish and remove the dwelling located at 100 Tyson Street and owned by Issac A. Artis, Jr. in the event the owner fails to comply with the provisions of Section 1 of this ordinance within ninety (90) days. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-128)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANT APPLICATION FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT

City Manager Davis reported that a notice of public hearing was published in The Daily Reflector on October 11, 2004 setting this time, date and place for a public hearing to consider a Local Law Enforcement Block Grant application for the Police Department.

Police Chief Joe Simonowich stated that the Police Department is eligible to receive funds from the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program. The amount available from BJA for Federal Fiscal Year 2005 is \$26,988, plus the required local match amount of \$2,999 for a total of \$29,987. The intent is to use the money to purchase handheld thermal imaging scopes similar to those used by the Fire Department. The Department hopes to purchase a total of four devices and assign one to each Patrol Platoon. The devices will assist in building searches, suspect location and apprehension, evidence recovery, and search and rescue. They will replace the two vehicle mounted thermal imaging devices the department now has. The vehicle-mounted units were purchased about 10 years ago with the intent to purchase two more so that each platoon would have one. That never occurred. The units are now approximately 10 years old and currently neither is operational. They have become obsolete and repair, if possible, has become cost prohibitive. Two of the criteria that must be met prior to the obligation of the BJA funds are a public hearing to solicit input from the community and a review of the purchase requests by an advisory board. The advisory board must include a representative from the Greenville Police Department, the local prosecutor's office, the local court system and a local non-profit or community group active in crime prevention or drug use prevention or treatment.

Mayor Parrott declared the public hearing open and solicited comments from the audience. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to approve the local law enforcement block grant application for the Police Department. Motion carried unanimously.

ADDRESS TO THE BOARD BY CITIZENS

Ms. Marion Blackburn stated that as the public's representatives, the Council is discussing the future of a public park on Tenth Street Extended, which is an area containing federally protected wet lands, meadows and woods. The City purchased the property with a dual role of providing a cemetery and park space. With the City's purchase of Homestead Memorial Gardens, the need

for burial space has lessened, but plans for a park can still go on. The City's Master Park Plan calls for a park in the general area of NC 33 and Portertown Road, the location of this property. The City Council has taken steps to ensure growth by setting in motion a bond referendum that could provide much needed money for capital projects. This decision reflects the Council's willingness to have a long-range vision for the City and to lay plans for a dynamic growing future. There was a great deal of interest in the park, and several citizens have circulated a petition of 193 names from throughout the City and County in less than two weeks. The discussion now focuses on whether to keep this land or allow it to be sold. While selling the land could raise short-term funds, it also raises long-term questions. If sold, there would still be a pressing need for a park at this location because of the exceptional growth taking place. Ms. Blackburn questioned whether there would be an equally suitable tract with ample space for ball fields and the diversity of wetlands, fishing ponds and a stream, and, if there were, what the price would be. Also, she questioned whether development of the area would create another assault on the quality of the City's water as this land drains directly into the Tar River, and what kind of development would take place on the property.

Ms. Blackburn stated that a pattern of apartments is spreading outward on Tenth Street from the City. While there have been assurances that only single-family homes will be constructed on this land, there is no way to make that a binding promise. Selling this land for development would open the door to sprawl and the concrete driveways and parking lots that come with it. The sprawl would create more burdens on the federally protected wetlands and the Tar River and would bring the documented ill effects of sprawl such as breathing problems, asthma, arthritis, high blood pressure and obesity. The Council is concerned with making sure that the City has the money to continue much needed city service programs and projects. This land can help. The land is already leased for farming providing year-to-year revenue and there are other lucrative sources, such as the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program funded by state and federal dollars, which would allow the City to reap hundreds of dollars per acre on qualifying tracts. These are just a few examples of programs that can generate money from this land, as could timber management and other uses. The Council has the opportunity to continue on a visionary track by reaffirming its commitment to a park on Tenth Street Extended, which would preserve the City's investment while wisely planning for the future by embracing the natural assets of this property, ample recreation space, wetlands, streams, fishing ponds, and fields.

Mr. Donald Williams, a resident of River Hills Subdivision, stated that he attended a meeting with the Recreation and Parks Department, and there was a great deal of excitement about a park on the Tenth Street Extended property. Residents in the area provided input stating that they would like ball fields and playgrounds for children, but not night baseball. Also, area residents talked about access in and out of the park and other considerations. Mr. Williams has lived next to the property for 20 years. It does not have much road footage. When taking his children to school, traffic is backed up beyond the Brook Valley entrance, and it is not unusual to wait four to six cycles of the traffic light on Greenville Boulevard to get through the intersection. Mr. Williams questioned the City's plans to deal with the traffic situation in the area and stated that a fire department is also being constructed in the congested area. If there is a fire in the early morning, the trucks will have difficulty getting out.

DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITION OF TRACT OF CITY PROPERTY LOCATED ON EAST TENTH STREET EXTENDED

Council Member Little stated that he had noticed there were beans growing on the Tenth Street Extended property and asked how much the City was renting the farm for, to which Mr. Tysinger responded that the City has a contract with a local farmer and is receiving approximately \$4,000 to \$6,000 a year for his farming rights.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller stated that he had received more e-mails, letters, misinformation and rumors regarding the Tenth Street Extended property than on any other item discussed by Council. He obtained the maps, minutes and copies of the appraisals on the property, and asked if a wetland delineation was prepared before the property was purchased.

City Manager Davis stated that he did not think a wetland delineation was prepared, but staff knew the condition of the land in the northern area from other previous experiences with the land.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller stated that the appraisal states that the property was purchased for \$151,000 in 1994, and the City purchased the property for \$737,000 in 1999. The land consists of approximately 120 acres, of which 47 acres is below the 100-year floodplain and is in the buffer area of swamp land next to the river, which is only good for potential use for open spaces. There are 72 acres of high land, which is cut in half by 10 acres of wetlands. There are 62 acres of net usable land, and the appraisal is based on 85 acres. The property only has 60 feet of frontage on Tenth Street. Mayor Pro-Tem Miller further stated that he read through the minutes of the public hearings that were held with residents of River Hills, and their concerns were very much like Ms. Blackburn's concerns expressed tonight such as no night ball games, preserve wildlife areas, control the access to the cemetery, no extension of sub-streets to the park property, annexations by River Hills, internal traffic patterns, plant buffer areas, and cemetery aesthetics. The City invested approximately \$750,000 in the Tenth Street property. He agreed that over half of the 119 acres, 60 or 70 acres, should always be preserved as part of the City's greenway and open space to protect the corridor on the north side of the river and tie the property into the greenway program. There are 50 acres of land that could be developed for single-family homes, compatible and similar to the River Hills area that would offer future residents of Greenville the same opportunities and quality of life that the people in River Hills enjoy. Mayor Pro-Tem Miller explained that he did not think it would be prudent to not investigate the possibilities of how to use the land. Mayor Pro-Tem Miller reminded the Council that the Director of the Parks and Recreation has clearly stated before that the Tenth Street Extended property is not a good use for recreational fields, ball fields and lighted fields, nor did the neighbors in that area want that type of park. If the City can market the property, then the Council needs to take a hard look at this property with the smaller part being set aside for environmental uses.

City Manager Davis informed the Council that the appraisal was done for the owner, Don Speight, who is now deceased. The appraisal was prepared for tax purposes and not to determine the City's offer to Mr. Speight. Nor was the appraisal commissioned by the City or reviewed or managed by the City.

Mr. Tysinger delineated the property on a map and responded to questions as follows:

Can a 60-foot road go through the wetlands area?

(RESPONSE: A road could be put through the wetlands, but there would have to be some mediation.)

Where was the cemetery originally planned to be located?

(RESPONSE: The cemetery was planned for the front part of the land, some on the middle section and then the back portion. The other 40 acres was planned for playing fields and playgrounds.)

Would there be lighted ball fields if the neighborhood park was built today?

(RESPONSE: A regional facility or community facility will generally have some nighttime lighted activities.)

Does a typical neighborhood have two to three acres?

(RESPONSE: Typically a neighborhood park would have from five to ten acres.)

If the 10 acres was combined with the 55 acres of lowland for open space and attached to the greenway, it would be a very nice park.

(RESPONSE: The front part of the property would probably not be conducive to ball fields because of the size.)

Is there no interconnectivity between the parcel and River Hills, unless a lot was purchased in River Hills to create a stub?

(RESPONSE: There is a stub that comes out of River Hills, but it comes to the lower portion of the Homestead property and not to the Tenth Street Extended property.)

Council Member Dunn stated that two kinds of parks were being discussed, one is a community park that would require considerably larger pieces of property and another type is the neighborhood park. According to the map, a community park is the type of park that is called for in the Eastern Pines area.

Mayor Parrott asked if the Council Members could all agree that the City is not interested in selling any of the environmentally sensitive lands.

Council Member Craft replied that he did not think there was any doubt about not selling the environmental sensitive lands, and asked where the bulk of timber was on the property.

Mr. Tysinger replied that the bulk of timber is in the lower wetlands where it is protected.

Council Member Craft stated that the Council received a letter from Releaf and he felt they were misinformed about the City's intentions and what would be done on the property. Mr. Craft further stated that another letter was received from one of tonight's speakers stating the City's Master Park Plan calls for a park at this specific location and is sorely needed because of the growth already under way in that area. That is incorrect. The City's Master Park Plan states that a park is needed in that area by the year 2020. The park is not sorely needed at this time. In

looking back to the minutes of the last Council meeting, Mr. Boyd Lee, Director of Recreation and Parks, stated that the Master Plan called for a community park east and west of Greenville to be built by 2020. A community park contains up to 80 acres and can serve a 2-4 mile radius, has a recreation building with a gym, ball fields, tennis courts, and walking trails. When the Tenth Street Extended property became available for purchase, the land was for a cemetery, and Mr. Lee expressed that for recreation and parks needs, this was not the kind of property needed.

Council Member Dunn disagreed and stated that she did not think that was the position that Mr. Lee took.

Council Member Craft stated that Mr. Lee only agreed to have the park there to be a team player, but that was not Mr. Lee's personal opinion.

Council Member Dunn stated that after the purchase of the Tenth Street Extended land, the City purchased an existing cemetery. Now there are 19 acres of land that were going to be used for a cemetery and she felt if people could be buried on that land then people could play on that land. There is also a portion of land that no one will buy because it is wetlands. Council Member Dunn asked where the money would go if the City sold any part of the Tenth Street Extended property. Council Member Dunn stated that the Council needs to think 20 years out because land does not get cheaper. The City needs a community park in the eastern part of the City as the Master Park Plan calls for. Whether this is the right place or not, the City owns the land and Council should be very careful about deciding to sell a portion of the property unless the City has plans to put it into more park land.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller stated that he agreed with Council Member Dunn that the land is worth more today than it was in 1999, but the problem is in 1999 the City paid more money than what the land was worth. The land is not worth today what the City paid for it in 1999. If the highlands could be combined with the farm to the east then in the future if there is a buyer, the properties could be combined and the City could recoup some of the investment in the property for single-family neighborhoods in that area. Mayor Pro-Tem Miller further stated that the Council should not be closed minded to this idea. Mr. Lee and his staff has made it perfectly clear that the Tenth Street Extended property is not suitable for park development and he would prefer to have the park in another location.

Mayor Parrott stated that he thought the consensus of the Council was that no one wanted to sell the wetlands and lowlands, but if someone came along and made an offer for the other land, the Council would consider the offer.

Council Member Dunn asked what the City would do with the money that was received for the land, and Mayor Parrott replied that he thought the money would go into capital reserve and would be reserved for a park somewhere in the eastern area.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller stated that for years the City has had a policy that when neighborhoods are developed, the developer would be required to set aside parcels for community parks, and the City would have a certain number of years to purchase the parcels for a park. Many of these parcels have never been purchased because the City has never had the money. Parks like Peppermint Park where children can ride their bikes to and play on the playground equipment are

the ones that are used. The City needs to have money so when there is an opportunity, the City will be able to purchase three or four acres in a growing subdivision to have a park.

Council Member Craft reminded the Council that the greatest need in growth was in the South Central School area. If the City is going to look at any type of Community Park, that is where the City needs to be looking.

Council Member Dunn stated that the City's Master Park Plan might need to be sent back to the Recreation and Parks Commission for revision.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller stated because the property only has a 60-foot road frontage, there is not enough frontage on the property to get traffic on and off of Tenth Street Extended. He questioned how there can be a large park there if people cannot get in and out of the property.

Council Member Dunn stated that the item should to be reviewed by the Recreation and Parks Commission.

APPROVAL TO ACCEPT MAINTENANCE OF PERSIMMON PLACE, BIRCH STREET, AND PORTION OF BAYSWATER DRIVE AS PART OF A MEDIATED SETTLEMENT OF FIRE TOWER ROAD LAWSUIT BETWEEN NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND OTHERS

City Attorney David A. Holec reminded the Council that Randy Doub has requested, on behalf of his clients, that the City consider adding Persimmon Place, Birch Place, and a portion of Bayswater Drive to the City street system as a part of a comprehensive settlement of a lawsuit concerning the Fire Tower Road project between his clients and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. City Council discussed this request at its September 9, 2004 meeting, and requested that discussions occur to attempt to achieve a compromise that will allow a settlement. Mr. Doub and Dave have had several discussions relating to this matter. Based upon those discussions, a proposed solution has been developed for Council's consideration that achieves the goal of Mr. Doub's clients in that there is an available method for the streets to become a part of the City street system. It also achieves the goals of the City in that the City does not incur an expense in improving the streets to the City public street standard and in that sufficient right-of-way is provided to allow maintenance of the streets. However, the solution does not deviate from the standard practice that the owner is responsible for making the improvements to bring the street up to City standards. For Bayswater Drive and Birch Place, the solution gives the owner the option to, instead, pay to the City the expense estimated for the necessary improvements so that the City can have the necessary improvements accomplished to bring the street up to City standards. Although this is a deviation from the standard practice, the expense to accomplish this remains with the owner. The solution offered included:

1. The City will accept Persimmon Place as a City street after it has been improved to City standards by the North Carolina Department of Transportation and the dedication to the City of sufficient right-of-way for the street is made by the person or entity having legal authority to do so. The expense of the dedication (including plat preparation) will be the responsibility of the person or entity making the dedication. Sufficient right-of-way means an area of adequate width which allows maintenance of the street—in addition to

the street width, usually at least five to six feet, on both sides of the street, outside of the pavement and curbing and guttering once the street is improved to City standards.

2. The City will accept a portion of Bayswater Drive as a City street after the dedication to the City of sufficient right-of-way of the street by the person or entity having the legal authority to do so (the owner of the street) and either improvement by the owner of the street to City standards or payment by the owner of the expense estimated by the City for the improvement of the street to City standards so that the City can proceed with having the improvement completed in accordance with its schedule. As was discussed, the estimate of the City for the improvement is \$15,000, but there will be a need for an onsite verification by the owner and a City representative during the week of October 4, 2004, to ensure that the owner and the City have the same understanding as to what constitutes "a portion of Bayswater Drive." Additionally, if the owner elects to pay the City the estimated expense of the improvement, then the dedication of the right-of-way and the payment of the estimated expense will need to occur prior to the City scheduling the necessary work. Also, the expense of the dedication (including plat preparation) will be the responsibility of the person or entity making the dedication.

3. The City will accept Birch Place as a City street after the dedication to the City of sufficient right-of-way of the street by the person or entity having the legal authority to do so (the owner of the street) and either improvement by the owner of the street to City standards or payment by the owner of the expense estimated by the City for the improvements of the street to City standards so that the City can proceed with having the improvements completed in accordance with its schedule. As was discussed, the estimated expense for these improvements is \$15,000. Additionally, if the owner elects to pay the City the estimated expense of the improvement, then the dedication of the right-of-way and payment of the estimated expense will need to occur prior to the City scheduling the necessary work. Also, the expense of the dedication (including plat preparation) will be the responsibility of the person or entity making the dedication.

City Attorney Holec concluded by stating that for each of the streets, the decision to proceed with having them proposed for acceptance as a part of the City street system should occur by the owner of the street in sufficient time to allow the necessary improvements to be completed on or before the completion of the Firetower Road Project (12-15 months).

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to excuse Council Member Little from voting on this issue due to a conflict of interest. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to approve the proposed solution relating to accepting maintenance of Persimmon Place, Birch Street, and portion of Bayswater Drive as part of a mediated settlement of Fire Tower Road lawsuit between North Carolina Department Of Transportation and others. Motion carried unanimously.

LEASE AGREEMENT WITH AMERICAN LEGION POST 160 FOR LEASE OF PROPERTY
AT CORNER OF CHESTNUT AND SKINNER STREETS - APPROVED

City Manager Davis stated that the City has leased a former fire station located at the corner of Chestnut and Skinner Streets to American Legion Post 160 for several years. The Post has made this building available for community groups and, as part of the proposed lease, will continue to make it available for community groups. Previously, Walt Morehead served as the primary contact and Post Commander. He has now turned these responsibilities over to Joe Daniels. As part of this change and the renewal of this lease, there are building improvements that Joe Daniels and the Post want to undertake. This is a five-year lease.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Council to enter into an agreement with American Legion Post 160 for lease of property at the corner of Chestnut and Skinner Streets. Motion carried unanimously. (Contract No. 339A)

ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE AS RECOMMENDED BY HUMAN RELATIONS
COUNCIL - ADOPTED

City Manager Davis informed the Council that at the September meeting, the Human Relations Council requested that City Council consider an ordinance to increase youth representation on the Board.

Council Member Council stated that Shaw University now has a branch in Greenville and she would like to see that University included as one of the institutions of higher learning.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to add Shaw University to the list of institutions of higher learning. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the ordinance amending the City Code as recommended by the Human Relations Council. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-129)

RESOLUTION AMENDING PAY AND CLASSIFICATION PLAN FOR FIRE/RESCUE
FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU - ADOPTED

Chief of Fire/Rescue Mike Burton, informed the Council that there are opportunities to improve the organization with the same number of four positions, which would accomplish the following:

- Develop a focus that includes fire safety advocacy and public education along with code enforcement
- Strengthen the connection between Fire Prevention services and the rest of the Fire/Rescue Department
- Increase the organizational depth of the Department
- Improve the management structure of the Department

He recommended changes that will still result in four positions in the Bureau. The changes call for the position of Fire Prevention Manager, which is vacant, to be eliminated; however, there

are two new proposed positions within the four positions of the Fire Prevention Bureau. The first will be a Senior Fire Codes Official who will focus his efforts on the code enforcement and fire investigation portions, along with first-level supervision of the two Fire Prevention Specialists. The second new position proposed is a Battalion Chief, who would provide overall management and coordinative services for code enforcement, fire investigation, public education (both fire safety and emergency management), fire safety advocacy, and building a stronger safety liaison with ECU. The number of positions within the Bureau will remain at four. This Battalion Chief will serve with the three other Battalion Chiefs. The Battalion Chiefs will periodically rotate to give better depth to the Department and depth to the individuals. The cost of this reorganization for this fiscal year will be approximately \$31,298, which includes the changes in rank structures and the costs of the regular position.

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Council to adopt the resolution amending the classification and pay plan and to authorize four positions in the Fire Prevention Bureau. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 04-45)

PROCESS FOR RENAMING GREENE STREET BRIDGE - ADOPTED

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Council Member Council to direct the Historic Preservation Commission and the Recreation and Parks Commission to recommend a name for the relocated Greene Street Bridge to the City Council. Motion carried unanimously.

2005 CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE - APPROVED

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Council to approve the following 2005 City Council Meeting Schedule, which deletes the June 20, September 5, and December 8 meetings as well as the July meetings. Motion carried unanimously.

The approved meeting schedule is as follows:

“COPY”

2005 CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE (ALL MEETINGS ARE HELD AT CITY HALL UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)

January 10—6:00 PM
January 13—7:00 PM
January 24—6:00 PM

February 7—6:00 PM
February 10—7:00 PM
February 21—6:00 PM

March 7—6:00 PM
March 10—7:00 PM
March 21—6:00 PM

April 11—6:00 PM
 April 14—7:00 PM
 April 25—6:00 PM

May 9—6:00 PM
 May 12—7:00 PM
 May 23—6:00 PM

June 6—6:00 PM
 June 9—7:00 PM

August 8—6:00 PM
 August 11—7:00 PM
 August 22—6:00 PM

September 8—7:00 PM
 September 19—6:00 PM

October 10—6:00 PM
 October 13—7:00 PM
 October 24—6:00 PM

November 7—6:00 PM
 November 10—7:00 PM
 November 21—6:00 PM

December 5—6:00 PM
 December 19—6:00 PM

“COPY”

ORDINANCE AMENDING BUDGET ORDINANCE RIVER PARK NORTH CAPITAL
 PROJECT - ADOPTED

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Little to adopt the ordinance amending the budget ordinance for the fiscal year 2004-05 and the River Park North Capital Project Budget. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance Nos. 04-130 and 131)

REQUEST BY PITT COUNTY FOR SEWER SERVICE IN PUG MOORE ROAD AREA

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to authorize sewer service in the Pug Moore Road area for a Community Development Block Grant. Motion carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS FOR ALLEN ROAD/GREENVILLE BOULEVARD
MAJOR WATER TRANSMISSION MAIN EXTENSION, PHASE III - ADOPTED
Water Capital Projects Budget Ordinance Amendment

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to adopt the ordinance amending the Water Capital Projects Budget. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-132)

Resolution for a low-interest loan from the N.C. State Revolving Fund Program

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to adopt the resolution for a low-interest loan from the North Carolina State Revolving Fund Program. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 04-46)

CONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT BIOSOLIDS
DEWATERING FACILITY PROJECT - ADOPTED

Sewer Capital Projects Budget Ordinance Amendment

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to adopt the ordinance amending the Sewer Capital Projects Budget. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-133)

Resolution allowing Greenville Utilities to reimburse itself from bond proceeds

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Dunn to adopt the resolution allowing Greenville Utilities Commission to reimburse itself from bond proceeds for work on the WWTP Biosolids Dewatering of Facility project. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 04-47)

CONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS FOR MT. PLEASANT 115 KV TRANSMISSION LINE -
ADOPTED

Electric Capital Projects Budget Ordinance

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Little to adopt the ordinance for the Electric Capital Projects Budget. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-134)

Resolution allowing Greenville Utilities to reimburse itself from bond proceeds

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to adopt the resolution allowing Greenville Utilities Commission to reimburse itself from bond proceeds for work on the Mt. Pleasant 115KV Transmission Line project. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 04-48)

PURCHASE OF THE REMAINING 1/3 INTEREST IN THE KEEL WAREHOUSE FROM JAMES LINDSEY AND SUE WORTHINGTON – APPROVED

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Council to approve the purchase of the remaining 1/3 interest in the Keel Warehouse from James Lindsey and Sue Worthington. Motion carried unanimously. (Contract No. 1293A)

PURCHASE OF THE SPORTS CONNECTION PROPERTY ON EAST FOURTEENTH STREET FROM GREENVILLE LITTLE LEAGUE – APPROVED

Motion was made by Council Member Council and seconded by Council Member Craft to approve the purchase of the Sports Connection property on East Fourteenth Street from the Greenville Little League. Motion carried unanimously.

BUDGET ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR THE ACQUISITION OF TWO PROPERTIES AND A BUDGET ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR THE OPERATION OF THE SPORTS CONNECTION BUILDING FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE FISCAL YEAR – ADOPTED

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to adopt the budget ordinance amendment for the acquisition of the 1/3 interest in the Keel Warehouse and the Sports Connection Property on East Fourteenth Street and a budget ordinance amendment for the operation of the Sports Connection Building for the remainder of the fiscal year. Motion carried unanimously. (Ordinance No. 04-127)

REPORT ON BIDS AWARDED

City Manager Davis referred the Council to bids that had been awarded as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>Awarded To</u>	<u>Amount</u>
9/02/04	Demolition of Keel Warehouse	Carolina Earth Movers	\$ 71,200
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Ballfield Lights	E& R. Inc.	\$241,685
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Ballfield Lights	E & R, Inc.	\$130,955
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Picnic Shelter	T & S Structural Solutions	\$ 23,637
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Fencing	Lester L. Everett, Jr.	\$ 35,000
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Irrigation System	L. R. Griffin & Associates	\$ 29,250
9/27/04	Materials and Labor to Install Playground	Miracle Recreation Equip.	\$ 48,407

COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Resolution for a 401 Money Purchase Plan for Wayne Bowers - Adopted

Motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and seconded by Council Member Craft to adopt the resolution establishing ICMA-RC 401(a) Program for incoming City Manager Wayne Bowers. Motion carried unanimously. (Resolution No. 04-49)

Recognition of Community Appearance Commission Awards

Council Member Craft stated that the September Community Appearance Commission awards went to First Presbyterian Church on Elm Street, the American Cancer Society McConnell Raab Hope Lodge on Wellness Drive and Orthopedics East on WH Smith Boulevard.

Other Comments

Council Member Glover expressed concern about people who complain about the bonds being requested for the West Greenville Revitalization. She urged people with concerns to call her.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller congratulated Fireman Lee as being named the Fireman of the Year by the Pitt-Greenville Chamber of Commerce.

Council Member Council stated that she did the welcome for the Northeast Original Free Will Baptist Church. On Saturday, the North Carolina Black Elected Municipal Officials Scholarship Committee will meet at Sheppard Memorial Library and will give three North Carolina youth a \$1000 scholarship.

Council Member Council stated that the North Carolina Sickle Cell Program, at its national meeting in Atlanta, unveiled a new stamp for Sickle Cell disease.

Council Member Council stated that the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Office is selling wreaths for the holiday for \$20 each. The funds raised will send 35 youth from Pitt County to Washington, DC.

Council member Dunn congratulated the Outstanding Fire/Rescue Person of the Year.

Council member Dunn encouraged citizens to vote on November 2.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Good News Report

City Manager Davis explained to Council how the firefighters made a device that would enable a handicapped youth to go through the Fire House after seeing the difficulty that a handicapped child has going through.

Caring Is Sharing Food Drive – November 8-17, 2004

City Manager Davis explained that Larry Suggs of the Fire/Rescue Department is the Chairman of the Caring is Sharing Food Drive this year. The food will go to five agencies. The KidsFest will be held on November 13 and each child is asked to bring two cans of food.

Closing Remarks as City Manager

City Manager Davis gave closing remarks as City Manager, citing his accomplishments and stating that he left the City in better form, fashion and quality than when he took over as City Manager.

Reminder of Greenville Utilities Water Supply and Sales Meeting – October 28 at 6:30 p.m. at Greenville Utilities Water Plant

City Manager Davis reminded the Council of the Greenville Utilities Water Supply and Sales Meeting that will be held at the Water Plant on October 28 at 6:30 p.m.

NCLM Annual Meeting in Raleigh – October 24-26

City Manager Davis reminded the Council of the NCLM Annual Conference in Raleigh from October 24-26.

Reminder that there is only one meeting in November – Monday, November 8, at 6:00 p.m. (since Thursday, November 11, is Veterans Day holiday)

City Manager Davis reminded the Council that there would be no Thursday night meeting in November because of Veterans Day.

COMMENTS FROM MAYOR

Mayor Parrott thanked the City Manager for doing everything he could to make the Mayor's job easier.

Council Member Dunn stated that City Manager Davis has handled himself very professionally.

ADJOURN

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Council Member Craft to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Wanda T. Elks
City Clerk